

REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 25, 2009. The Applicants thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of an interview on October 8, 2009 at 1:00 PM EDT (10:00 AM PDT). The Examiner and the Applicants discussed a proposed amendment to Claim 1. The Examiner is thanked for helpful comments and suggestions.

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 18, 21, 24 and 27-31 are amended. Claims 22-23, 25-26 and 32 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute cancelled claims in divisional or continuation applications. New Claims 33-42 have been added. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 31 can be found in the specification as filed at least in paragraphs [0008], [0030]-[0039] and Claims 16-19 as filed. Support for the amendments to Claims 5 and 13 can be found in the specification as filed at least in paragraphs [0008], [0030]-[0039], [0045] and Claims 16-19 as filed. The amendments to Claims 2-3, 9, 18, 21, 24 and 27-30 further clarify the subject matter which is claimed and do not add new matter. Support for new Claims 33-36 can be found in the specification as filed at least in paragraphs [0021]. Support for new Claims 37-39 can be found in the specification as filed at least in paragraphs [0027]. Support for new Claims 40-42 can be found in the specification as filed at least in paragraphs [0025]. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-31 and 33-42 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13-14, 18 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Rekimoto* (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0044858 A1) (hereinafter *Rekimoto*).

Amended Claim 13 contains the limitation “presenting the first content at the second display device, wherein a propagation order of the second content followed by the first content represents the sequence, wherein initiating the gesture simultaneously changes both the first display device and the second display device.” The Applicants respectfully submit that *Rekimoto* does not disclose these limitations. Accordingly, amended Claim 13 is not anticipated by *Rekimoto*.

Claims 14, 18 and 27-30 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claim 13, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claim 13 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 9-10, 21-26 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Rekimoto* in view of *Kataoka* (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,117) (hereinafter *Kataoka*).

Claims 22-23, 25-26 and 32 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

Amended Claim 1 contains the limitations “a propagation order of the third content followed by the second content followed by the first content represents the sequence” and “initiating the gesture changes all of the first display device, the second display device and the third display device.” Since *Rekimoto* and *Kataoka* do not teach or suggest these limitations, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. MPEP 2143.03. As such, Claim 1 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Amended Claim 5 contains the limitations “the gesture initiates propagation of content from right to left which indicates content to be moved and a direction without designating the destination” and “initiating the gesture simultaneously changes both the first display device and the second display device.” Since *Rekimoto* and *Kataoka* do not teach or suggest these limitations, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. MPEP 2143.03. As such, Claim 5 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Amended Claim 31 contains the limitation “a propagation order of the second content followed by the first content represents the sequence, wherein initiating the gesture changes all of the first display device, the second display device and the third display device.” Since *Rekimoto* and *Kataoka* do not teach or suggest these limitations, they do not teach or suggest all

limitations of the claim. MPEP 2143.03. As such, Claim 31 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 21, 24 and 31 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1, 5 and 31, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 1, 5 and 31 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 24, 2009

By: /Anthony G. Craig/
Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910